

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10 SAN JOSE DIVISION
11

12 DORA SAMANO,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 TARGET CORPORATION, et al.,

16 Defendants.
17

Case No.: C 10-5285 PSG

**ORDER THAT CASE BE
REASSIGNED TO A DISTRICT
JUDGE**

18 The initial case management conference in this case is set for January 25, 2011, and the
19 deadline for filing a joint case management statement was January 18, 2011. (*See* ADR Scheduling
20 Order.) As a result, the parties were required either to file written consent to the jurisdiction of
21 the magistrate judge or to request reassignment to a district judge, no later than January 18, 2011.
22 *See* Civ. L. R. 73-1(a)(1). Defendant Target Corporation consented to magistrate judge jurisdiction
23 on December 2, 2010. (*See* Consent to Proceed Before a U.S. Magistrate Judge by Target and Joint
24 Case Management Statement.) Plaintiff neither consented nor requested reassignment.

25 This court subsequently extended the deadline for Plaintiff to consent to magistrate judge
26 jurisdiction to January 27, 2011 and continued the case management conference to February 1, 2011.
27 (*See* Order Cont. Case Mgmt. Conf. and Setting Deadline for Parties Either To File Written Consent
28 to the Jurisdiction of Mag. Judge or To Req. Reassignment to District Judge, Jan. 20, 2011.) Again,
Plaintiff neither consented nor requested reassignment.

ORDER

1 In light of Plaintiff's repeated failure to provide consent to the jurisdiction of the
2 undersigned, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT this case now be reassigned to a district judge.

3
4 Dated: January 31, 2011

5 
6 PAUL S. GREWAL
7 United States Magistrate Judge
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ORDER